fpm

Ms. Roach starts her response with accusing Robert Spencer and I of having “reckless hate”. I have never hidden my hatred of Islam and have not denied it. I believe Islam is deserving of our hate as much as Nazism, fascism and all other racist nefarious doctrines are. There is nothing wrong to hate ignorance, violence, barbarity, and discrimination. A medical researcher hates disease and I hate Islam which is the disease of mind. My love is reserved for humanity and not for hate mongering doctrines that divide mankind and advocate violence and terror. Nonetheless I am religion blind, race blind and gender blind. I do not see these differences. I am blind to them. Therefore I love Muslims; just the same way I love Jews, Christians, Atheists or any other person. Unlike Islam I do not divide mankind into believers and unbelievers and do not hate people for what they believe. I fight against ideologies of hate not against victims of those ideologies.

Ms. Roach says **torturing prisoners**, is completely forbidden in Islam. Or is it?

“In March 2002, Iran 's parliament (Majles) passed a bill aimed at limiting the widespread practice of torture and the use of forced confessions in criminal trials. On Sunday June 9, the bill was rejected by the Council of Guardians, a body of twelve senior clerics appointed by the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamene'i, whose role is to ensure that all laws passed by the Majles are compatible, in their view, with Islam. The Council argued that the bill would limit the authority of judges to adjudicate on the admissibility of confessions and therefore ruled that the **bill was against the principles of Islam**.” [Source]

Perhaps Ms. Roach would tell us that Iran is not a true Islamic country. Was Muhammad a true Muslim?

“Some people were sick and they said, "O Allah's Apostle! Give us shelter and food. So when they became healthy they said, "The weather of Medina is not suitable for us." So he sent them to Al-Harra with some she-camels of his and said, "Drink of their milk." But when they became healthy, they killed the shepherd of the Prophet and drove away his camels. The Prophet sent some people in their pursuit. **Then he got their hands and feet cut and their eyes were branded with heated pieces of iron. I saw one of them licking the earth with his tongue till he died.”** Bukhari 7. 71.58

In another story, we read that “After Muhammad raided the fortress of Kheibar and the unarmed population were taken by surprise, Muslim fighters killed many of the citizens until they surrendered. Muhammad allowed them to leave the country, but that they should give up all their property to the conqueror. With the rest, came forth ***Kinana***, chief of the Jews of Kheibar, and his cousin. Muhammad accused them both of keeping back, in contravention of the compact, a portion of their riches, especially the treasures of the Bani Nadhir, which Kinana had obtained as a marriage portion with his wife, Safiyah the daughter of the chief of that tribe. "*Where are the vessels of gold*," he asked," *which you used to lend to the people of Mecca ?*" They protested that they no longer possessed them. "*if you conceal anything from me,*" continued Muhammad, "*and I should gain knowledge of it, then your lives and the lives of your families shall be at my disposal*." They answered that it should be so. A traitorous Jew, having divulged to Muhammad the place in which a part of their wealth was deposited, he sent and fetched it. **On the discovery of this attempt at imposition, Kinana was subjected to cruel torture, --**

"fire being placed upon his breast till his breath had almost departed," -in the hope that he would confess where the rest of his treasures were concealed. Muhammad then gave command, and the heads of the two chiefs were severed from their bodies." [Tabari]

On that very night Muhammad took the 17 year old Safiyah the bride of Kinana to his tent slept with that grieving woman and claimed her as his wife.

Ms. Roach; addressing someone with "dear" is neither patronizing nor sexual harassment. It is a sign of respect. It is a polite way to address people as in "Dear Sir", "Dear President", etc. But if that is offensive to you I shall refrain addressing you as Dear Ms. Roach.

Ms. Roach writes: "If any Muslim woman feels she is oppressed, it is up to her to ask Allah's help and then with Allah's help free herself by any means necessary, even if it means death." Thank you Ms. Roach for your advice! I believe most women prefer to be delivered by the rule of law – a law that protects their rights, dignity and lives rather than seek death, like many Muslim women do in Iran and other Islamic countries. The rights to live and to be free are birth rights of every human being. In the kafirdom of the West women don't have to supplicate Allah and seek death. They are protected by the law and enjoy the same rights that men do.

Realizing the absurdity of her own statement Ms. Roach introduces a red herring:

"Some people will criticize me saying that a woman shouldn't have to choose to die in order not to be beaten, but I ask you: What do we tell American women who are in domestic violence situations?"

First of all the incidences of domestic abuse in America or other civilized non-Islamic countries compared to the pandemic abuse of women in Islamic countries are negligible. Second, I would tell to the American women who are victims of violence to immediately go to authorities and seek protection. I am afraid such thing for women in Islamic countries can happen only in their dreams. The Sharia law is not on the side of the abused woman. In Islamic countries there are no shelters for abused women. They either endure the pain of slavery or beseech Allah for death.

In comparing the fate of the abused women in Islam and the West Ms. Roach says; "At least in Islam if this [is] the case, a woman will attain paradise with Allah if she is the innocent victim of a psychopath, instead of just another domestic violence statistic."

That sums up everything. A woman in Islam will remain a slave and abused by her psychopath husband and her freedom is in her death and a vacuous promise of a paradise. Interestingly in her previous statements Ms. Roach assured us that if she is abused she would fight back and defend herself. Why Ms. Roach? Aren't you interested to go to paradise? Are you going to risk to go to hell and be burned for eternity by rebelling against your husband? Apparently in your philosophy death is good but only for the neighbors.

Dear Mr. El Mallah (I hope you do not think I am patronizing or sexually harassing you by calling you dear) you wrote: "my understanding of Quran/Hadith comes from scholars'

opinions." Are these opinions in agreement with the Quran and hadith? Why follow the opinion of the scholars when you can perfectly read the Quran and haidith on your own and come to your own conclusion?

I see you constantly blame the Muslims and say: "Muslims in the so called Muslim countries are not aware of their religion." Do you think the Quran and the misogynistic examples set by Muhammad have nothing to do with the violence perpetrated against women? Do you really believe if Muslims start reading the Quran and learn that women are like tilt to men 2:223, that they are less than men, 2:228, that their rights to inheritance and testimony are half 4:11-12, 2:282, that if disobedient they should be beaten 4:34, that they are deficient in intelligence and the majority of them will go to hell, and other not so flattering remarks such as these, they will start respecting women more?

You accuse me of judging Islam and Quran based on the behavior of the people. I have not done so and will not do that. I first quote the Quran then the hadith and then show the effect of these on Muslims. I reject Islam for what Muhammad said and did and not for what Muslims do. Curiously, instead of the nefarious anti woman influence of the Quran and hadith you find the influence of America and secularism responsible for the misogyny in Islamic countries. This attitude is mind boggling. But then again you are the same people who blame CIA and Mossad for the 9/11.

You say that the bottom line is that Allah promised: "They shall have all that they will desire with their Lord. That is the reward of the good doers." 39:34

So the bottom line is that paradise is a child's fantasyland. You can wish anything and it will be yours. But isn't this statement in disagreement with other verses of the Quran that clearly describe how paradise is made and how many celestial whores men get? (The word whore in English is the same Persian word hoor borrowed by Muhammad and used in the Quran) Suppose you want 75 or 750 whores; can you have your wish? If so why Muhammad specified two in one place and seventy two in another place? Why even give a number when the choice is left up to the believer? This to me seems contradiction. Muhammad talks about four rivers of wine, milk, honey and water running in paradise. If it is up to me I like fruit juices of various kinds and champagne too. And I do not like them running as rivers but rather served in bottles. Why the Quran describes the paradise when the fantasies of the believers set the limit?

Mr. El-Mallah goes on to say that the Quran is easy to understand. In fact this is what Quran itself claims on several places. He accused me of misinterpreting verse 30:21. Despite the fact that I quoted various Muslim scholars who thought this verse means women are like animals created for the enjoyment of men. In fact the way women are treated in Islamic countries show most Muslims are in agreement with those scholars. Can Mr. El-Mallah explain how a clear and easy to understand book such as the Quran has been so misunderstood by the majority of Muslims? Why only those Muslims who try to sell Islam to the Westerners understand it? Finally why instead of teaching the "peaceful Islam" to the Westerners, you do not try to correct the misunderstandings of the Muslims?

I said the relationship between husband and wife in Islam is akin to that of employer and employee. Actually it is more like master and slave relationship. As Mr. El-Mallah

reaffirms, the matrimonial house is HIS. She lives in HIS house. The children are HIS. In the case of divorce Muslim women have no right to the custody of their own children unless the child is an infant and even then he should be given to the father after he is weaned or is no more a toddler. Yes, he is to provide for her food, cloth, medicine, accommodation, transportation etc. But wouldn't any master do the same for his slave? If you had a she ass, wouldn't you provide her for her food, accommodation, saddle, etc?

Both Ms. Roach and Mr. El-Mallah repeated that husband has the obligation to satisfy his wife sexually. This is news to me. Let us get practical here. A man with four wives (actually some Muslims believe that there is no limit to the number of wives in Islam) will enjoy sex four times more frequently than either one of his wives. So if he has sex 12 times per month, each of his wives can have it only three times per month (provided he does not have favorites and the older and uglier wives are not neglected). As you can see, this claim is utterly baseless. Furthermore in some Islamic countries, Muslims, inspired by a hadith mutilate their girls' genitals so they can never have orgasm even if the husband does his best. It is interesting that Muslims insist that black is white and vice versa.

Mr. El-Mallah claims Islam treats men and women equally because it puts equal responsibility on both parties. He confuses responsibility with rights. Yes, we know in Islam woman is responsible for a lot of things including obeying her husband and satisfying him sexually, even when she does not feel well. A hadith says:

"Allah's Apostle said, "If a husband calls his wife to his bed (i.e. to have sexual relation) and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, the angels will curse her till morning." Bukhari 4.54.460

In another place we read:

"The prophet of Allah said: When a man calls his wife to satisfy his desire, let her come to him though she is occupied at the oven." Mishkat al-Masabih, English translation, Book I, Section 'Duties of husband and wife', Hadith No. 61.

In Islam the duties and responsibilities of the wife are stated clearly. But where are her rights? Does she own anything? Can she have any claim to the house that she is living in, to her children or even to the cloths that he has bought for her with HIS money? In Islam women have many responsibilities but very few rights.

Mr. El Mallah wrote: "Mr. Sina is claiming that 'A good marriage is one where husband and wife are equal partners in every sense'. Well, does that mean that the wife can tell her husband "why is it me who should carry the baby in my tummy?"

I am afraid our friend is confusing again responsibilities with rights. Of course men and women are different, biologically, emotionally, psychologically and in many other ways. Each one has his/her own strength and that is why they form the partnership. In any partnership the partners compliment each other. For example you put the capital and I put the expertise and the labor and we make a partnership. The reason you and I form the partnership is because each one of us has something the other one does not have but needs. In a marriage, husband and wife, each contribute according to their capacity and strength. Here we are talking about rights. If you and I form a "partnership", where

you put the money and I put the labor, where you order me and I obey you, where everything is in your name, and if we split you keep everything and I walk away with nothing, where you have even the right to beat me, this is not partnership. This is slavery, because during the years I worked for you, you paid me no salary. I have no savings. You only maintained me, paid for my food and clothing so I could continue to work for you. And now that I am older, you kick me out and I am entitled to nothing. I can do only one thing and that is pray to Allah to take me away. That is not partnership. That is not even employment. That is slavery. Marriage in Islam is slavery for women and nothing else.

Mr. El-Mallah asks what is unfair with Khole where a woman can obtain divorce after forgoing her dowry. The unfair part is the forgoing of the dowry. This means that if a husband decides to get rid of her wife and give her nothing, he would beat her so much that she is forced to forego her rights just to get her divorce. Not only she gets nothing from his wealth, she is forced to even forego the little gifts that he had bought for her. I honestly believe this is unfair. Don't you Mr. El-Mallah?

As for the incident between Muhammad and Jauniyya, the princess of Bani Jaun, the text of the hadith is clear. Muhammad made sexual advances on her and told her "give yourself to me as a gift". The word used here is *habba*. This is not a proposal for marriage. Habba which means "give as a gift" is free sex. The favor is paid back with a gift from the man to the woman in the form of goods or money. There are other hadiths that point out to this practice. One apocryphal hadith that sheds light on this practice is about Abdullah the father of Muhammad who was allegedly approached by a woman who told him, "Take me as a gift". But Abdullah went to his wife and conceived Muhammad. On his way back he went to that woman and declared his readiness for the proposition but she spurned him saying, "before I saw a light in your forefront; now that light is gone, you gave it to another woman so go away". This hadith is fabricated to claim that the prostitute had recognized the light of Muhammad while he was still in his father's testicles. It is a ludicrous hadith fit for the gullible Muslims. But it is important because it shows the practice of *habba* was common among the Arabs. (See also Muslim 8.3253) In our language we call it prostitution.

The hadith says Muhammad asked Jauniyya to give herself to him in habba, she responded "Can a princess give herself (in marriage) [sic] to an ordinary man?" Muhammad raised his hand to pat her [sic] so that she might become tranquil." Any reasonable person can figure out what happened. Muhammad's advances must have offended this woman for her saying "Can a princes give herself to an ordinary man? The word (marriage) is put in parenthesis because it is the insertion of the translator. Then the hadith says "Muhammad raised his hand to pat her so she become tranquil". Obviously she had become upset. Women do not get offended by marriage proposals; they get offended when they are cheapened and solicited for sex. Then she exclaimed "I seek refuge with Allah from you." It is clear that this "patting" must have been of a violent nature. Clearly the writer of the hadith (or the translator) must have felt embarrassed of such conduct of his prophet and has tried to soft sell a violent incident by choosing mild words. The so called "patting" must have been threatening enough to make the woman exclaim "I seek refuge with Allah from you". It must have been also guilt inducing for Muhammad enough to try to compensate her with gifts (stolen from her own people) The whole story is despicable and certainly not worthy of a man who claimed to be the best example to follow. It depicts Muhammad as a lecher, a man of short tempers and unbalanced. First he is overtaken by lust, then anger and violence and then guilt. These

are hardly the traits of sane people.

In his latest statement Mr. El-Mallah says that it is not the NAME of the Sura (The Women) which is the testimony of her high status of women in Islam but the CONTENT of this chapter that makes this clear. I am happy that the alibi of the name of the Sura is withdrawn. But as we saw, it is in this chapter that Muhammad says beat your wives. There is no mention of equality of rights for women neither in this chapter nor anywhere else in the Quran.

Mr. El-Mallah says that "the financial security for a Muslim woman is guaranteed. Her Husband is responsible for that, if she has no husband, then it is her father, brother, or uncle. If she has no family, then it is the State that should take care of her financially. So under the Islamic law, a woman doesn't need to fend for herself."

The simple question that begs an answer is why not giving the woman her independence so she can fend for herself and earn her own living with dignity and not be a burden to others? This is unfair to both men and women and puts her at the mercy of men all her life. She is reduced to a virtual beggar. What if the brother has his own family to feed? What if there are several single sisters and only one brother or one aging father? What if the uncle does not want to maintain his niece because he has his own family to take care for? Why keep a woman in slavery and maintain her? Why put her in a jail and then provide for her? Why she can't be a free, productive member of the society? Why she should live like a parasite all her life, be humiliated and lose her dignity and pride? Who benefits from this? What is the rationale of this absurd and idiotic law? Stupidity is the other name of Islam. Actually the word Islam means surrendering ones intelligence. Muslims are unable even to pose these simple questions let alone answer them.

To justify the violence against women in Islam Mr. El-Mallah reported a long list of the statistics of crime and violence in America. This is a logical fallacy very much in vogue with Muslims. It is called *tu quoque*. This is the famous "you too" fallacy. They immediately try to find a mote in the eyes of others to justify the beam in their own. Yes indeed no country is without crime and violence. However the violence happening in Islamic countries against women is not even crime. It is a common practice and a norm; it is not reported and not punished because it is not against the law of sharia. In the West violence against women is a crime and that is why you see statistics. This is a perfect example of the pot calling the kettle black.

But the bigger problem of Mr. El-Mallah's argument is that it is a red herring. We are not criticizing the Islamic countries and how bad Muslims are. We are criticizing Islam. So we should compare Islam to the American Constitution and the Declaration of Civil Rights, and the Muslims to the Americans. Are they comparable in any ways?

I think through this symposium we established that Islam is an anti woman religion par excellence. Women in Islam are barely regarded above animals and their marital status is barely superior to slavery. As Ms. Roach eloquently put it, a **Muslim woman's freedom comes in her DEATH**. So if you are an abused women living in an Islamic country, Ms. Roach's advice to you is pray Allah so he may precipitate your death and set you free. Meanwhile Ms. Roach who lives in a non-Islamic country and is protected by the laws of the Kafirs, boasts about her own "courage" to fight back if her husband becomes abusive. This she thinks is the sign of her superior intelligence. What she does not want to see is

that you can't fight back because you are a woman condemned to live in an Islamic paradise, ruled by sharia, the same sharia that she so ardently is trying to implement across the globe. Ms. Roach lives in the state of cognitive dissonance. Her professed beliefs and her actions are a world apart. In layman's term there is only one word to describe that: Hypocrisy!

It is good that Mr. Mallah sees equality in verse 33:35. Unfortunately most Muslims do not see what he sees and as the result women in Islamic countries are not treated as equals. Mr. Mallah may think this is because Muslims do not practice the true Islam, but maybe it has to do with the fact that either his understanding of the Quran is inaccurate or the Quran is not clear enough and the majority of Muslims and I can't read any equality in that verse.

The verse 3:135 stresses the fact that everyone will be remunerated but does not say they will be remunerated equally. If the owner of a factory tells his employees that after the sale of the product he will pay everyone it does not mean he is going to pay everyone equally. In the same way he may want to emphasize the interdependence of everyone involved and say you are of one another. This does not imply that the managers and the janitors are equal. The same argument can be made about the other verses Mr. Mallah quoted.

Mr. Mallah complains why Mr. Spencer and I did not mention the verses and hadiths that praise women. Yes indeed there are some verses and hadiths that praise women but we are talking about rights. Praising women does not imply they have equal rights. I could have lots of praises for my dog; this does not imply I consider him equal to humans. Furthermore there are other verses and hadiths that denigrate women. For example verse 30:21 says "He created for you, of yourselves, spouses, that you may repose in them" The Arabic text makes it clear that "for you" is masculine and "them" is feminine. What this verse is conveying is that women are created FOR men and are for their enjoyment.

Razi in At-Tafsir al-Kabir, commenting on this verse wrote:

"His saying 'created for you' is a proof that women **were created like animals and plants** and other useful things, just as the Most High has said 'He created for you what is on earth' and that necessitates the woman not to be created for worship and carrying the Divine commands."

Hadi Sabzevari, an eminent Muslim scholar, in his commentary on another grand Muslim thinker, Sadr al-Mote'alihin wrote:

"That Sadr ad-Deen Shirazi **classifies women as animals** is a delicate allusion to the fact that women, due to the deficiency in their intelligence and understanding of intricacies, and due to their fondness of the adornments of the world, are truly and justly among the mute animals [al-haywanti al-sa^mita]. They have the nature of beasts [ad-dawwa^b], but they have been given the disguise of human beings so that men would not be loath to talk to them and be compelled to have sexual intercourse with them. That is why our immaculate Law [shar'ina al-mutahhar] takes men's side and gives them

superiority in most matters, including divorce, "nushuz," etc.

Ms. Roach says we won't understand the Quran unless we do not read the Tafsir. She is right. But Tafsirs often incriminate Muhammad even more, unless they are written by modern apologists and for the consumption of the westerners.

I can quote many more great Islamic scholars both of past and present with similar views about women. Are they all quoting out of context?

Mr. Mallah thinks just because Muhammad names men and women together in one sentence then they mush be equal. But we have hadiths where Muhammad names asses, women and dogs in one sentence. Muslim 4,1232 says a man's "**prayer would be cut off by (passing of an) ass, woman, and black Dog**". I can see more similarity here than when men and women are mentioned in one sentence?

Mr. Mallah says we failed to mention that in Islam the husband is responsible to provide for the family and the wife is not required to contribute with a penny. Is that a good thing? This is precisely the source of inequality and tension between husband and wife. They are not seen as partners but rather as employer and employee. The relationship is contractual. She is to provide a service for him, (give birth to HIS children, satisfy HIS sexual needs, take care of HIS property, etc) and in exchange he is required to maintain her. Is there any difference between this dynamism and that of a master and his slave?

The verse 2:228 does not just imply but it is explicit that men are superior to women. It says very clearly: "but men have a degree (of advantage) over them...". Can you be more explicit than that?

If we are mistaken can our Muslim friends tell us which Islamic country has understood this equality that they talk about and is applying it? How is it possible that all the Muslims are so confused about what the Quran says that in 1400 years they have not been able to implement the true Islam? Didn't Muhammad claim that the Quran is a "clear book" (5:15) "easy to understand" (44:58 , 54:22 , 54:32, 54:40) "explained in detail" (6:114), "conveyed clearly", (5:16, 10:15) and with "no doubt" in it (2:1)?

Mr. Mallah quoted several verses where women are mentioned but none of them suggest that women are equal in rights to men. Telling men to treat their wives with kindness does not imply equality. One could say, be kind to animals. This does not mean animals have equal rights to humans.

The very fact that Mr. Mallah quotes these totally unrelated verses shows there are no verses in the Quran that speak of equality. On the other hand there are many verses that show women are inferior to men.

Mr. Mallah claims the verse 4:11-12 that says women inherit half of their male siblings does not mean that a sister is worth half of her brother. We are not talking about "worth". We are talking about rights. Value is an abstract thing. How much you value me is irrelevant to me. But I expect you to respect my rights and treat me equally. Values are subjective, rights are tangible and objective. In Islam women are not treated equally. They do not have the same rights that men have.

Now since we started talking about “worth” I think it is worth mentioning that in Saudi Arabia if a person has been killed or caused to die by another, the latter has to pay blood money or compensation, as follows:

100,000 riyals if the victim is a Muslim man

50,000 riyals if a Muslim woman

50,000 riyals if a Christian man

25,000 riyals if a Christian woman

6,666 riyals if a Hindu man

3,333 riyals if a Hindu woman

Source: The Wall Street Journal, April 9, 2002

So as you see people's worth are not the same in Islam. It depends on their gender and their religion. How is it that these custodians of the two holy mosques have got it so wrong? Is there any Islamic country that understands this equality our Muslim friends are talking about?

Mr. Mallah also boasts that in Islam husband is responsible to maintain his wife even if the wife is wealthier than him and has other sources of income. Is that justice? Does that help to solidify love and unity between husband and wife? How would you feel if suddenly your wife receive a huge inheritance and become a multi millionaire but do not share a penny from her wealth with you and at the same time demand that you to maintain her with your meager salary? Can such marriage survive?

From whichever angle you look at it, Islam is flawed. All these emphasize the fact that the marital relationship in Islam is akin to relationship between employer with his employee or even a slave and master. Employers are not allowed to beat their employees and they are supposed to remunerate them. Marriage in Islam for woman is slavery. A good marriage is one where husband and wife are equal partners in every sense. That is not what happens in Islam. The wife enters in the husband’s household as an employee and can be fired at anytime. All he has to do is to utter “I divorce thee” and the marriage is over. And woe if he utters this three times out of rage because then he will not be able to re-marry her unless she marry someone else, consummate the marriage with that new husband, divorce him and then she can remarry her original husband. Amazing is the wisdom of Allah.

Mr. Mallah says verse 33:50 has nothing to do with rape. Actually it has. If you take the verse 4:24 where Muhammad says: “Also (prohibited are) women already married, **except those whom your right hands possess**...” it becomes clear that a Muslim is allowed to have intercourse with his right hand possessions (slaves, women captured in war) even if these right hand possessions are already married. If you still doubt the meaning of this verse, there is a hadith that can make this clear. Bukhari 7,62,137 talks about Muslim warriors who used to have sex with woman captured in war. But because they did not want to impregnate them and wanted to return them for

ransom after raping them, they went to Muhammad asking about coitus interruptus (spilling the sperm on the ground). The prophet did not prohibit the raping of the women but rather said do not do coitus interruptus because if God has destined for a soul to be born it would be born anyway. See also Bukhari 8.77.6

Maybe I should remind our friends that Rayhana and Safiyah were Jewish women (both in their teens) who were captured by Muhammad and the prophet slept with them in the same day that he murdered their fathers, brothers, husbands and other relatives. Although Safiayh after losing every person in her family, felt she had no choice but to marry Muhammad, Rayhana refused to marry the murderer of her tribe (Bani Quriaza) and remained in his household as a sex slave until he died. Anther victim of Muhammad was Juwairiyah belonging to another Jewish tribe.

In explaining the verse 4:34 Mr. Mallah says the beating must be light, should not leave any marks and must be with "toothbrush". This is not clear from the verse and certainly millions of battered Muslim women have not benefited by this addendum. Also the way Mr. Mallah explains this verse sounds more like foreplay. Beating with toothbrush? Is that a joke? Why beat at all? Even if it is symbolic, and it is only intended to establish the dominance of man over woman the question is why. Why should men dominate women even symbolically? However, millions of battered Muslim women can testify that there is nothing symbolic in this beating. They are often beaten so much that their bones are crushed. I personally recall women coming to our house showing their bruises to my mother and crying.

Mr. Mallah says Islam allows the wife to divorce her husband through what is known as “khole”.

What is khole? Khole is when women agree to forgo alimony and to repay their husbands any dowry in exchange of having the right to divorce. It is supported by this hadith: abudawud12.2220 . Is that fair?

This is a great tool in the hand of a man who wants to get rid of his wife and not pay her alimony and get back the dowry. All he has to do is to beat her and make her life miserable until she takes her freedom and forgoes her rights. This happens everyday where Sharia is practiced.

I do not see any justice in this. Women in Islamic countries are often not allowed to work so they do not have money. They receive half of the inheritance of their brothers so fanatically they are in disadvantage. Divorce means assured poverty and extreme hardship. Often death is preferable and the rate of suicide among women is very high (especially in Iran).

Mr. Mallah says: “In Islam, if the husband beats a wife without respecting the limits set down by the Quran and Hadith, then she can take him to court and, if ruled in her favor, she can be given the right to apply the law of retaliation and beat the husband as he beat her.”

I am sure Mr. Mallah is trying to use some humor here. I never heard of a woman beating her husband by court order. But this gives us an idea of the concept of marriage in Islam. Imagine children raised in such families. No wonder the majority of Muslims have such

high egos and such low self-esteems and they burst into violence at a drop of a hat. They come from dysfunctional families where violence is seen as a legitimate means of conflict resolution. Because Muslim families are dysfunctional, Islamic societies are dysfunctional and Muslims are unable to live in peace with others.

When I said only ibn Sa'd says Summayyah was martyred by Abu Jahl I was talking about the original historians. In fact even ibn Sa'd is not one of the originals. He is a student of al Waqidi and al Waqidi does not say such thing. The original historians are Ibn Ishaq and ibn Hisham who compiled the Sira, al Tabari and al Waqidi. These were the ones who collected the history and compiled it. Everyone else quoted them. Al Bayhaqi was born in 384 A.H. in Persia . He and others who made such claim must have relied on Ibn Sa'd's authority. The story is apocryphal as I made it clear that Summayyah married Azrak and bore him Salama after the death of her husband Yaser. .

Mr. Mallah says "In Islam Victims of rape are not punished in anyway. They are victims..!"

Is that true? In Islam the testimony of one woman is not valid. So a woman who is raped and can't produce a witness (generally rapists do not rape in public so the likelihood of finding a witness is very slim) cannot accuse her assailant. However if she becomes pregnant there is a clear proof that she has had sex out of wedlock and she can be accused of adultery and stoned to death. This is not hypothetical. It happens all the time. We all remember the case of Amina Lawal, the Nigerian woman who was sentenced to stoning and was released after Amnesty International and the whole world was mobilized. But there are many more cases. (See also this)

The question is why people's sex life should be the concern of the society and government. Why two consenting adults should be lashed for sleeping together? Why adulterers should be stoned to death? If your wife commits adultery just divorce her. Why resort to such barbaric and primitive practice? Adultery is morally wrong. But morality is something between an individual and his or her creator. The spouse is the only person affected not the society. The state has no right to intervene in people's personal lives. Morality and religion should not be imposed by force. Last month in Iran a 14 year old boy was flogged to death for eating during the month of Ramadan. If a person wants to fast or not should be his personal choice. But beating a person is a crime. Islamic code of law is criminal. Imposing religions morality is criminal. It is amazing that Muhammad saw nothing wrong in raping women captured in war but prescribed stoning the adulterers.

It is reported that Muhammad said: "I was about to order for collecting firewood and then order someone to pronounce the Adhan for the prayer and then order someone to lead the people in prayer and then I would go from behind and burn the houses of men who did not present themselves for the (compulsory congregational) prayer." Bukhari 9.89.330 This is sickening. Muhammad was a controlling man. He could not tolerate anyone not obeying him.

Dr. Sam Vaknin is a psychologist specializing in Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) He writes: "The narcissist perceives every disagreement - let alone criticism - as nothing short of a THREAT. He reacts defensively. He becomes indignant, aggressive and cold." [source]

The above perfectly describes Muhammad. He had the profile of a cult leader like Jim

Jones or David Koresh and suffered from NPD. Now the whole Islamic world reflects the same pathological trait of their prophet. Narcissism is contagious. (An exegesis on this subject will be given in my upcoming book)

Ms. Roach tries to tackle this problem by flaunting her own example as a liberated Muslim woman. She is by no means a typical Muslim woman. She lives in America (or another western country, I presume) and she is protected by the secular laws. If her husband raises his hand on her, she can afford to fight back or lock him up in jail. Her husband knows that too and he behaves himself. I have come to know many ex-Muslim women who told me that their husbands were “charming and cute” until they lived in the West but as soon as they moved to their Islamic countries they changed and beatings started. The story “Not Without My Daughter” by Betty Mahmoodi is a true story and it has happened to countless western women who married to Muslim men.

Ms. Roach says: “If I were beaten by anybody, husband or no, you can bet your life I would fight back!”

Dear Ms. Roach. Praise the real Lord that you do not live in an Islamic country. It is this Kafirdom that you despise that empowers you to say such things. Please know that Muslim women who endure abuse are no less intelligent than you. They however, do not have your luxury to be protected by the infidel's laws. They live in Islamic countries where they have no rights.

A couple of months ago a story circulated in the Internet about an Iranian woman who had gone to the court asking the judge to tell her husband to beat her only once a week and not every day. Everyone thought that was funny. I wrote an article on that explaining why. All she wanted was to live and she was willing to be beaten once a week for that privilege which kafir women take for granted. She knows if her husband divorces her, she has nowhere to go except end up as beggar in the street. After I wrote that article, no one was laughing anymore. The story did not look funny anymore. It reminded the readers of the painful reality of the Muslim women trapped in Islamic countries. Ms. Roach has no understanding of how a typical Muslim woman lives and what she has to endure. In solitude of her pains, she turns her face to the same god that sealed her pitiable fate and cries in silence for help. What a sad irony! What a cruel joke!

Ms. Roach says “There is nothing anywhere in any of the texts that tells women to take beatings from anyone,” So what she thinks of Q 4:34? This denial is mind boggling.

Even more mind boggling is when she says: “There is no real Islamic society today on the national level, there is no real and complete implementation of Sharia law.”

That is an amazing statement. After 1400 years 1.2 billion Muslims have not managed to implement the Sharia law in any of the 57 Islamic countries. Isn't it reasonable to conclude that such utopian Islamic paradise exists nowhere except in Ms. Roach’s fantasies? Maybe it is time that the deluded Muslims wake up and realize that Islam is it. When a country becomes Islamic, it does not become better; it becomes barbaric.

No dear Ms. Roach, I do not condemn Islam because of "some people’s backward interpretation of it". I condemn Islam for what Muhammad did and said. I condemn Islam because he assassinated those who criticized him including a 120 year old man and a

poetess, mother of five small children. I condemn him for raiding civilians without any warning for killing unarmed men who had gone after their daily business and for enslaving their women and children; for selling humans and for looting innocent people. I condemn Muhammad for traitorously beheading 750 innocent Jews of Bani Quraiza after they surrendered to him without a fight. I condemn him for torturing and blinding people with red hot bars of iron to force them to reveal where they had hidden their treasures and then after killing them he showed their beheaded corpses to their wives and took one of them (Safiyah) to the tent and slept with her on the same day. I condemn him for introducing religious intolerance in a very tolerant Arabian society and for inaugurating religious wars and killings that has lasted up to this day and is still taking its tolls. Arabs prior to Muhammad were as tolerant as Hindus. There are a hundred reasons for which I condemn Muhammad and none of them have anything to do with the actions of his followers.

Dear Ms. Roach. I know it is hard for you to accept that Muhammad actually meant beat when he said beat your wife. But you must either accept Islam as is or reject it. Daraba does not mean “light tap”. It means beat. It does not mean play music like beating a drum, it says beat your wife. You can deny as much a you like and hide your head deep in the sands but you can't change the truth. Beating is supported by hadith too.

Abu Dawood 11. 2142: “The Prophet said: A man will not be asked as to why he beat his wife.”

Another cute story of wife beating can be found in this hadith: muwatta30.2.13 Here a woman tries to trick her husband so he stops sleeping with their maid. But Umar tells him to beat his wife and to go to his slave-girl.

Another cuter story is when Muhammad raises his hand to beat a woman who rejects his advances. Bukhari 7.63.182

There are many cute and “inspiring” stories such as these, but this should suffice for now.

Ms. Roach boasts that she would fight back anyone who beats her but she does not mind if other Muslim women are beaten, provided they are “disrespectful” and “irresponsible”.

Who can determine if someone is disrespectful and irresponsible? Who should be the judge? .. The husband! Who should apply the punishment? Also the husband! And of course the husband is also the plaintiff. Doesn’t this seem a little unjust? I see a clear case of conflict of interests. Since every aspect of this “justice” hinges on the husband’s whims, he is the one who can decide whether his wife has been uppity enough to deserve punishment. How this system can guarantee that women will not be beaten wantonly?

Moreover, does beating really work? Is it right to treat "disrespectful" women like animals? In this day and age you can’t even beat an animal but Muslims insist the there is nothing wrong in beating the wife. Isn’t divorce better than violence?

As we can see Islam is nothing but savagery. It must be outlawed. Everything in Islam is

inhuman and barbaric. The civilized world must not allow the proliferation of this doctrine of hate and terror.

Symposium: Gender Apartheid and Islam

Does Islam contain within itself the keys to liberate women within contemporary Islamic societies? Frontpage Symposium's guests today are:

Mohamed El-Mallah, a board member of Al-Ittihad Mosque in Vista, former board member of Islamic Center of San Diego, and an associate member of the Muslim American Society. A native of Egypt who migrated to the U.S. seven years ago, he is an activist in the Muslim Community of San Diego who has given many series of presentations on Islamic History.

Robert Spencer, the director of Jihad Watch and the author of Onward Muslim Soldiers: How Jihad Still Threatens America and the West (Regnery Publishing), and Islam Unveiled: Disturbing Questions About the World's Fastest Growing Faith (Encounter Books);

Julia Roach, a UCSD student currently pursuing a bachelor's in literatures of the world, specializing in gender issues and women in literature. She converted to Islam in 2003;

and

Ali Sina, the founder of Faith Freedom International (www.faithfreedom.org), a movement of ex-Muslims created to provide support for those who want to leave Islam and give factual information about Islam for others.

FP: Mr. El-Mallah, Julia Roach, Robert Spencer and Ali Sani, welcome to Frontpage Symposium.

Mr. El-Mallah, let me begin with you. Does Islam have the keys to liberate women and give them equality or is Islam and women's rights mutually exclusive?

El-Mallah: Thanks for inviting me. Hopefully everybody is planning to fast the six days of Sha'ban (Lunar Month).

Jamie, I will go back 1425 lunar years to answer your question. A woman came to the Prophet (PBUH) and asked him: "Why women are not mentioned (in Islamic sources: Quran and Hadith) as much as men?" Do you know how the Prophet (PBUH) answered? He answered her publicly, he went directly to the Masjid, and asked all the people to gather and from the pulpit he addressed the people by reciting the verse Q33:35 that says: "For Muslim men and women, for believing men and women, for devout men and women, for true men and women, for men and women who are patient and constant, for men and women who humble themselves, for men and women who give in charity, for men and women who fast (and deny themselves), for men and women who guard their chastity, and for men and women who engage much in Allah's praise, for them has Allah prepared forgiveness and great reward." This verse clarifies that the rule is whenever the pronoun "He" is used, it can be substituted by the noun "She" with few exception, which are clearly explained in other verses of Quran and sayings of the Prophet (PBUH).

I would like to point out that the first to accept Islam was a woman, the first martyr in Islam was a woman, one of the longest chapters in Quran is named “The Women,” another chapter is named “Mariam”. We need to separate between what some of the Muslims practice, and what Islam is ordering us to do. We cannot put Islam on a trial because of wrongs that are done by people who have been living in countries that teach them nothing about Islam. Most of the wrongs that you see done by some Muslims, are done because the lack of good Islamic understanding.

Giving the above, we can categorize the reasons behind any misconceptions about women in Islam into two: The lack of knowledge of Islamic teachings and the ill-intentions of Islam bashers.

FP: Ms. Roach?

Roach: First I would like to preface my comments with a sad fact that exists within the current state of the Ummah or worldwide Islamic community: it is unfortunate that Islam is not practiced in all parts of the world by all Muslims to the standard prescribed by Allah in the Qur’an and exemplified by the blessed prophet Mohamed (peace and blessing of Allah be upon him.)

Nor is Christianity or Buddhism always practiced by all practitioners as it supposed to be. However, when we examine the conduct of those Muslims striving to seek knowledge as they have been commanded by their Lord we find that those people are practicing the deen of Islam in light of its sacred texts and the traditions of the prophets (may the blessings of Allah be upon them all) which do contain proof that women's equality and Islam are not mutually exclusive.

The first and perhaps foremost important aspect of this is spiritual or religious equality: Women's souls have equal value to those of Men's as proved by numerous verses in the Qur’an in which Allah references the believing men and the believing women with equal importance and responsibility in terms of religious obligations such as charity, fasting, prayer, humility etc. Unlike the tradition practiced by some Christians in which the woman submits to her husband who then in turn submits to God, Muslim women are to submit to the Lord of the worlds Allah first and foremost, they do not need an emissary to answer for them.

Muslim women can pray by themselves or in a group in which no male need be present to worship their lord and that worship will be accepted as much as any other person's worship (in sha Allah, If God wills). Similarly a woman's sin is counted as much as a man's too! A woman's rights are protected, such as the right to life, which women could not be guaranteed in the pre-Islamic Arabian period (many female infants were murdered because boy children were preferred, Islam abolished this practice and Allah mentions the testimony of the murdered female child as being one characteristic of the day of Judgment). What right could be more serious than to be able to fight and die in battle?

Muslim women have had the right and opportunity to fight and die in battle for the past 1400 years, a right which was just recently bequeathed to American women, and the death of a female in battle counts just as much as a man's death: she is still a martyr and merits paradise (in sha Allah).The first martyr in Islam was a woman, women fought

alongside the Prophet (pbuh) in numerous battles, some sustaining serious injuries. Muslim women have always had the right to vote and their vote has always equalled a man's, the right to own and dispose of property without having to obtain permission from male kin, the right to work outside the home, the right to equal work for equal pay, the right to keep her hard earned money for herself, the right to marry whom they wish and deny whom they wish, the right to sexual satisfaction within her marriage, (if a woman is unsatisfied she can obtain a divorce) etc. etc. etc.

I will not burden you with too much more (yes there is more!) It is unfortunate that more people do not get beyond their conception of the headscarf and ask us why we are proud to wear it...because we are Muslims and we are happy with our Lord and our lives, we are not being smashed by gender inequalities when we stand up for our own rights. Oh, one more thing, Muslim women are required to educate themselves about their deen and are urged to receive a formal education of some sort, putting them on the intellectually equal playing field as well.

FP: Ok so Mr. Spencer, it appears that women are being oppressed in Muslim structures because certain men in power have misinterpreted Islam for their own purposes. So Muslims can reform Islam and make it a religion in which women are equal and given liberty right? The only problem is that I have a hunch our definitions of liberty and equality are quite different from what many Muslims take it to mean. What do you think?

FP: Mr. Sina?

Sina: Hello Jamie and thank you for inviting me to this symposium.

This subject is really vast. I try to be as brief as possible but please do not expect miracles. There is much to be said and I can't condense everything in a couple of paragraphs.

Mr. El-Mallah quotes the verse 33:35 where men and women are mentioned and their responsibilities and rewards are enumerated. How Mr. El-Mallah concludes that this verse establishes equality between man and woman is beyond me. If I say to you that you and your dog go for a walk, play in the park, do this, do that and when you come back I have a treat for both of you, does that imply that you and your dog are equal? I see no hint of equality in that verse.

Let us see what the Quran says about women. It says "men have a degree (of advantage) over them" 2:228 ; that the witness of woman is worth half of that of man 2:282; that women inherit half of their male siblings, 4:11-12; that a man can marry two or three or four women 4:3; that if a women becomes captive in a war, her Muslim master is allowed to rape her 33:50; that if a woman is not totally submissive to her husband she will enter the Hell 66:10; that women are "tilt" for their husbands (to cultivate them) 2:223 that men are in charge of women, as if women were imbeciles or minors who could not take care of themselves; that they must be obedient to their husbands or be admonished (verbally abused), banished from the bed (psychologically abused) and beaten (physically abused) 4:34. These verses define the station of women in Islam.

Another "proof" that Mr. El-Mallah presents to prove the high status of women in Islam is

that one of the long surahs of the Quran is named "Women". May I remind Mr. El-Mallah that the longest surah of the Quran is named "Cow" (286 verses). The surah Women is only 176 verses. According to Mr. El Mallah's logic cows must have a higher status than women. Another big surah is surah Livestock. It has 165 verses. Therefore women are just eleven points superior to livestock but 110 points inferior to cows. In fact even insects and bugs such as bees, ants and spiders have surahs named after them. Should women be trilled for having a surah named after them?

Another "proof" presented by Mr. El Mallah is the fact that the first believer in Muhammad was a woman. Why should this be an indication that women have equal rights?

The next "evidence" that he presents is that the first martyr in Islam also was a woman. Muslims must think this is such a convincing proof that it was also presented by Ms. Roach.

Apart from the fact that this in no ways indicates equality of rights for women in Islam the story is apocryphal. Our Muslim friends are talking about Summayyah. Ibn Sa'd is the only historian that says Summayyah suffered martyrdom in the hands of Abu Jahl. If this martyrdom really had occurred; it would have been trumpeted forth by every biographer and would have been reported in innumerable traditions. This is just an example of the exaggerations that Muslims have been fond of making from the beginning.

In fact the same biographer also claims that Bilal was also the first martyr, though he long survived the alleged persecutions, came back to Mecca and chanted the Azan from the roof top of Ka'ba after Muhammad conquered that town and he died a natural death.

Ibn Sa'd describes that Summayyah, her husband Yasir and their son Ammar were persecuted in Mecca (p. 227) But after Yasir (who died of natural causes) Summayyah married the Greek slave Azrak and with him had a son called Salma. How then are we to understand that she died under persecution? Azrak belonged to Taif, and was one of the slaves who at the siege of that city (some fifteen years later), fled over to Muhammad's camp. It is natural to conclude that Summayyah, after Yasir's death, married Azrak, and lived at Taif.

Ms. Roach laments that Islam is not practiced in all parts of the world by all Muslims to the standard prescribed by Allah in the Quran.

For that we should give thanks to God. Imagine if the whole Muslims were to stone or hang victims of rape or flog women for minor offenses such as exposing a flock of hair. In fact the countries that practice Islam to its fullest are truly barbaric. Just think of the suffering of the women in Afghanistan during the rule of the Taliban. Women were not allowed to go out of their homes or work. Male doctors were not allowed to visit female patients. So, when women became sick, there was no one to take care of them and they died. The more a country becomes Islamic the more hellish it gets.

Ms. Roach comforts herself by thinking that after women die they can expect to be treated equally and says "Women's souls have equal value to those of Men's". In other words what she is saying is that while women live a life of slavery, abuse and deprivation in this world they can rejoice because after they die they will be treated as equals. Although I find this a vacuous bargain, the truth is that even this promise is not true.

Women in Islam are not treated equally even in death.

Men are promised many virgins after they die. What do women get? They get their old lousy husband to share with 72 voluptuous celestial virgins. With that many high-bosomed houries why would any man want to spend a night with an old wife? Do women get also young celestial studs to have orgies with? No they don't. They have to maintain their "modesty" even after their death. The truth is that in Islam men and women are not treated equally even after their death.

In fact according to Muhammad few women ever make it to Paradise . The majority of them end up in Hell. Let us see what the Prophet says in this regards. This is where he describes his hallucinatory visit to hell and paradise:

"Then I saw the (Hell) Fire, and I have never before, seen such a horrible sight as that, and I saw that the majority of its dwellers were women." The people asked, "O Allah's Apostle! What is the reason for that?" He replied, "Because of their ungratefulness." It was said. "Do they disbelieve in Allah (are they ungrateful to Allah)?" He replied, "They are not thankful to their husbands and are ungrateful for the favors done to them. Even if you do good to one of them all your life, when she seems some harshness from you, she will say, "I have never seen any good from you.' " Bukhari 7.62.125

Ms. Roach says Muslim women can pray by themselves. Is that the sign of their equality and liberation? Can't women of other Faiths pray by themselves? Wouldn't God accept their prayers?

Ms. Roach says that in pre-Islamic Arabia female infants were murdered and Islam abolished that. Muslims truly believe that this was a common practice. If that was the case where the Arab women came from? They also claim that Muhammad raised the status of women by limiting a man to no more than four wives. How could Arab men have so many wives if they practiced female infanticide?

Perhaps some ignorant people killed their newborn daughters, but that could not have been a common practice. Infanticide is just against human nature. After all Arabs were also humans. They must have had the same kind of parental instincts that we have. Even animals have parental instinct. Yes exceptions always occur. Even today female infanticide is practiced in China and in India . But it is an abhorrent practice frowned by the society and punished by the law. The cases are extremely rare. The pre-Islamic Arabia could not have been different. What Muhammad said was commonsense and agreed by everyone. Let me make an example. We read in the news that some men kill their wives. How common is this practice? It is extremely rare. But suppose I declare myself a prophet and among other things prohibit wife killing. Not a big deal, everybody knows wife killing is bad. A thousand years from now my zealot followers claim that in Pre-Sinaic period of ignorance people practiced wife killing and his holiness Ali Sina (pbuh) abolished this repugnant practice. How ludicrous it sounds to you? Well, it is no more ludicrous than the claim of the Muslims who say Muhammad abolished female infanticide

Among the "rights" of the Muslim women, Ms. Roach claims that the "right" to fight in battle is the most important. She says "*What right could be more serious than to be able to fight and die in battle*?"

Is this a right? Wouldn't it have been better if instead of wars Muhammad had brought peace to the world and gave women (and men and children) the right to live in peace? He called upon Muslims to wage war in the name of God and shed the blood of their fellow human beings.2:216, 9:39 Is this something good? Didn't humans have enough wars already? Did they need a prophet from God to give them the "right" to kill and die? He took away the right to think, the right to believe in the faith of one's choice, the right to self determination and instead gave them the right to wage war, to kill, to hate, to "instill terror in the heart of the enemy" 8:12, to destroy this world and to die. Is this a right? Muhammad gave Muslims the right to live in hell, the right to be slaves, the right to be abused by a tyrannical belief, the right to be stoned, to be flogged, to become terrorists and burn this world . Why he did not give them the right to live in peace, be happy and love mankind?

In America and other civilized countries, people have the right to freedom, to life and to the pursuit of happiness. In Islam Muslims have the right to wage war and to die. Are we still supposed to believe Islam is a divine religion? The problem with Islam is that it destroys one's values. The right becomes wrong and evil is praised as good. Now seriously; how a Muslim woman can fight wrapped in her burqa? That is something worth seeing.

Furthermore are non-Muslim women prohibited to fight if they want to? Do we know of any women in any society that does not have the "right" to fight and die.

Maybe Ms. Roach should read the biography of her prophet once again. She will notice that even the pagans used to take their wives to the battlefield. In the battle of Uhud it was Hind the wife of Abu Sofyan who was roaring like a lioness and encouraging the men to march forward. In those days women used to accompany their husbands to the battle to provide logistics for them and to nurse them if they were wounded. Muhammad did what other Arabs did. However after Islam, when Muslims started to put into practice their prophet's teachings they found there is no room for women in anywhere including in the battlefield and hence women were discarded and were relegated to second class citizens.

Ms. Roach says "Muslim women have always had the right to vote". How can this be true when even Muslim men do not have the right to vote? In Islam there is no democracy. How can you vote where there is no democracy? Lack of democracy in Islam is another interesting subject worth exploring.

Ms Roach says women in Islam have the right to own and dispose of property without having to obtain permission from their male kin. Is she forgetting that Khadijah, prior to marring Muhammad was a businesswomen who had made a fortune running her own trading business and who had many men at her service? Can women succeed in any Islamic country the way Khadijah succeeded in a pagan society? Was there a single woman after Khadijah in any Islamic country during these 1400 years that has rivaled her success? The answer is no! Doesn't this prove that there are fewer opportunities in Islamic world for women than what Khadijah had in a pagan world? It is clear that women have lost their rights after Islam and did not gain anything from it.

Ms. Roach says Muslim women have the right to work outside the home. I wonder why

she did not tell that to the Taliban. They prohibited women from working outside the home. Also I would like to ask her how a woman can work outside the home when she can't be in a room alone with a man and can't travel alone without a male kin (mahram). Muhammad discouraged women from going out of their home and in fact he said that it is better for them to pray in the privacy of their home (read prisons) than pray in the mosque. In some Islamic countries women are not even allowed to drive a car. How they are supposed to go to work if they can't even get there unless someone drives them to and from work?

Ms. Roach says Muslim women have the right to marry whom they wish. I ask her, how can a 9 year old child consent to a marriage? How can a Muslim woman be free in her choice when she is not allowed to date the man whom she is planning to marry in order to know him? How can you choose when you do not even know the person? How can you make any intelligent and educated decision when you do not know your prospect mate? A blind choice is not a choice.

She also claims that Muslim woman has the right to sexual satisfaction within her marriage and clarified that "if a woman is unsatisfied she can obtain a divorce". First of all is that exclusive to Islam? Can't non-Muslim women divorce for any reason they want? Secondly is this true in the case of Islam? Under the Sharia women are not allowed to divorce even if their husband beats them. The decision to divorce rest only on man's whims. Now imagine a women going to a Judge demanding divorce accusing her husband of impotency. How can you humiliate the gigantic ego of a Muslim man and expect to live after that? She will be a dead woman the next day. If she survives and manages to divorce, she will be seen as a whore by everyone. A divorced woman has nowhere to go in the Islamic world. I do not know whether Ms. Roach has ever lived in an Islamic country. Muslim women are not allowed to have any libido. It is not pious for women to have sexual feelings. In fact the genital mutilation is designed to take away any sexual pleasure from them. Women are not supposed to enjoy sex. If they have any libido, there is a risk that they may fornicate and commit sin. Women must only provide satisfaction to their husbands and deny all their own sexual needs. According to a tradition:

"Allah's Apostle said, "If a husband calls his wife to his bed (i.e. to have sexual relation) and she refuses and causes him to sleep in anger, the angels will curse her till morning." Bukhari 4.54.450

It is hilarious to think that the angels have nothing better to do than sit around and curse the poor woman all the night for depriving them from watching the live porno show. If Allah must punish woman for not satisfying the sexual needs of their husbands why he needs angels to lobby him for it? Isn't it a waste of angel's resources?

This is a long subject and I have just scratched the surface. In one sense it is funny and in another it is a tragedy. In fact the whole Islam is nothing but a tragic comedy.

One of the charges I have brought against Muhammad is the charge of misogyny. Here is the charge. I invite Ms. Roach to read the charge and try to refute it. I promise to remove that charge if she manages to prove I am mistaken.